

1 ERIC C. SOHLGREN, Bar No. 161710
2 ecs@paynefears.com
3 LINDLEY P. FRALEY, Bar No. 223421
4 lpf@paynefears.com
5 PAYNE & FEARS LLP
6 Attorneys at Law
7 4 Park Plaza, Suite 1100
8 Irvine, CA 92614
9 Telephone: (949) 851-1100
10 Facsimile: (949) 851-1212

11 ERIC A. WELTER, VA Bar No. 38193
12 eaw@welterlaw.com
13 WELTER LAW FIRM PC
14 720 Lynn Street, Suite B
15 Herndon, VA 20170
16 Telephone: (703) 435-8500
17 Facsimile: (703) 435-8851

18 Attorneys for Defendant
19 7-ELEVEN, INC.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 KIMBERLY ALEKSICK,
11 individually and on behalf of other
12 members of the general public
13 similarly situated,

14 Plaintiffs,

15 v.

16 7-ELEVEN, INC., a Texas
17 Corporation, MICHAEL TUCKER;
18 an individual; and DOES 1-50,
19 Inclusive,

20 Defendants.

21 CASE NO. 08 CV 0059 J (WMC)
22 The Hon. Napoleon A. Jones, Jr.

23
24
25
26
27
28

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES OF DEFENDANT
7-ELEVEN, INC. IN OPPOSITION
TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO
REMAND TO STATE COURT**

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
5510
5511
5512
5513
5514
5515
5516
5517
5518
5519
5520
5521
5522
5523
5524
5525
5526
5527
5528
5529
5530
5531
5532
5533
5534
5535
5536
5537
5538
5539
5540
5541
5542
5543
5544
5545
5546
5547
5548
5549
55410
55411
55412
55413
55414
55415
55416
55417
55418
55419
55420
55421
55422
55423
55424
55425
55426
55427
55428
55429
55430
55431
55432
55433
55434
55435
55436
55437
55438
55439
55440
55441
55442
55443
55444
55445
55446
55447
55448
55449
55450
55451
55452
55453
55454
55455
55456
55457
55458
55459
55460
55461
55462
55463
55464
55465
55466
55467
55468
55469
55470
55471
55472
55473
55474
55475
55476
55477
55478
55479
55480
55481
55482
55483
55484
55485
55486
55487
55488
55489
55490
55491
55492
55493
55494
55495
55496
55497
55498
55499
554100
554101
554102
554103
554104
554105
554106
554107
554108
554109
554110
554111
554112
554113
554114
554115
554116
554117
554118
554119
554120
554121
554122
554123
554124
554125
554126
554127
554128
554129
554130
554131
554132
554133
554134
554135
554136
554137
554138
554139
554140
554141
554142
554143
554144
554145
554146
554147
554148
554149
554150
554151
554152
554153
554154
554155
554156
554157
554158
554159
554160
554161
554162
554163
554164
554165
554166
554167
554168
554169
554170
554171
554172
554173
554174
554175
554176
554177
554178
554179
554180
554181
554182
554183
554184
554185
554186
554187
554188
554189
554190
554191
554192
554193
554194
554195
554196
554197
554198
554199
554200
554201
554202
554203
554204
554205
554206
554207
554208
554209
554210
554211
554212
554213
554214
554215
554216
554217
554218
554219
554220
554221
554222
554223
554224
554225
554226
554227
554228
554229
554230
554231
554232
554233
554234
554235
554236
554237
554238
554239
554240
554241
554242
554243
554244
554245
554246
554247
554248
554249
554250
554251
554252
554253
554254
554255
554256
554257
554258
554259
554260
554261
554262
554263
554264
554265
554266
554267
554268
554269
554270
554271
554272
554273
554274
554275
554276
554277
554278
554279
554280
554281
554282
554283
554284
554285
554286
554287
554288
554289
554290
554291
554292
554293
554294
554295
554296
554297
554298
554299
554300
554301
554302
554303
554304
554305
554306
554307
554308
554309
554310
554311
554312
554313
554314
554315
554316
554317
554318
554319
554320
554321
554322
554323
554324
554325
554326
554327
554328
554329
554330
554331
554332
554333
554334
554335
554336
554337
554338
554339
5543310
5543311
5543312
5543313
5543314
5543315
5543316
5543317
5543318
5543319
55433100
55433101
55433102
55433103
55433104
55433105
55433106
55433107
55433108
55433109
55433110
55433111
55433112
55433113
55433114
55433115
55433116
55433117
55433118
55433119
554331100
554331101
554331102
554331103
554331104
554331105
554331106
554331107
554331108
554331109
554331110
554331111
554331112
554331113
554331114
554331115
554331116
554331117
554331118
554331119
5543311100
5543311101
5543311102
5543311103
5543311104
5543311105
5543311106
5543311107
5543311108
5543311109
5543311110
5543311111
5543311112
5543311113
5543311114
5543311115
5543311116
5543311117
5543311118
5543311119
55433111100
55433111101
55433111102
55433111103
55433111104
55433111105
55433111106
55433111107
55433111108
55433111109
55433111110
55433111111
55433111112
55433111113
55433111114
55433111115
55433111116
55433111117
55433111118
55433111119
554331111100
554331111101
554331111102
554331111103
554331111104
554331111105
554331111106
554331111107
554331111108
554331111109
554331111110
554331111111
554331111112
554331111113
554331111114
554331111115
554331111116
554331111117
554331111118
554331111119
5543311111100
5543311111101
5543311111102
5543311111103
5543311111104
5543311111105
5543311111106
5543311111107
5543311111108
5543311111109
5543311111110
5543311111111
5543311111112
5543311111113
5543311111114
5543311111115
5543311111116
5543311111117
5543311111118
5543311111119
55433111111100
55433111111101
55433111111102
55433111111103
55433111111104
55433111111105
55433111111106
55433111111107
55433111111108
55433111111109
55433111111110
55433111111111
55433111111112
55433111111113
55433111111114
55433111111115
55433111111116
55433111111117
55433111111118
55433111111119
554331111111100
554331111111101
554331111111102
554331111111103
554331111111104
554331111111105
554331111111106
554331111111107
554331111111108
554331111111109
554331111111110
554331111111111
554331111111112
554331111111113
554331111111114
554331111111115
554331111111116
554331111111117
554331111111118
554331111111119
5543311111111100
5543311111111101
5543311111111102
5543311111111103
5543311111111104
5543311111111105
5543311111111106
5543311111111107
5543311111111108
5543311111111109
5543311111111110
5543311111111111
5543311111111112
5543311111111113
5543311111111114
5543311111111115
5543311111111116
5543311111111117
5543311111111118
5543311111111119
55433111111111100
55433111111111101
55433111111111102
55433111111111103
55433111111111104
55433111111111105
55433111111111106
55433111111111107
55433111111111108
55433111111111109
55433111111111110
55433111111111111
55433111111111112
55433111111111113
55433111111111114
55433111111111115
55433111111111116
55433111111111117
55433111111111118
55433111111111119
554331111111111100
554331111111111101
554331111111111102
554331111111111103
554331111111111104
554331111111111105
554331111111111106
554331111111111107
554331111111111108
554331111111111109
554331111111111110
554331111111111111
554331111111111112
554331111111111113
554331111111111114
554331111111111115
554331111111111116
554331111111111117
554331111111111118
554331111111111119
5543311111111111100
5543311111111111101
5543311111111111102
5543311111111111103
5543311111111111104
5543311111111111105
5543311111111111106
5543311111111111107
5543311111111111108
5543311111111111109
5543311111111111110
5543311111111111111
5543311111111111112
5543311111111111113
5543311111111111114
5543311111111111115
5543311111111111116
5543311111111111117
5543311111111111118
5543311111111111119
55433111111111111100
55433111111111111101
55433111111111111102
55433111111111111103
55433111111111111104
55433111111111111105
55433111111111111106
55433111111111111107
55433111111111111108
55433111111111111109
55433111111111111110
55433111111111111111
55433111111111111112
55433111111111111113
55433111111111111114
55433111111111111115
55433111111111111116
55433111111111111117
55433111111111111118
55433111111111111119
554331111111111111100
554331111111111111101
554331111111111111102
554331111111111111103
554331111111111111104
554331111111111111105
554331111111111111106
554331111111111111107
554331111111111111108
554331111111111111109
554331111111111111110
554331111111111111111
554331111111111111112
554331111111111111113
554331111111111111114
554331111111111111115
554331111111111111116
554331111111111111117
554331111111111111118
554331111111111111119
5543311111111111111100
5543311111111111111101
5543311111111111111102
5543311111111111111103
5543311111111111111104
5543311111111111111105
5543311111111111111106
5543311111111111111107
5543311111111111111108
55433111111111

1 TABLE OF CONTENTS
2

3	TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
4	I. INTRODUCTION	1
5	II. STATEMENT OF FACTS	3
6	A. Procedural History.....	3
7	B. The Parties	4
8	C. The Independent Contractor Relationship Between	
9	7-Eleven and Tucker	5
10	III. LEGAL ARGUMENT	7
11	A. The Applicable Legal Standard.....	7
12	B. 7-Eleven Has Established the Substantive Elements	
13	for Removal Jurisdiction	9
14	C. 7-Eleven's Removal of the First Amended Complaint	
15	Was Timely	10
16	1. 7-Eleven Removed Within Thirty Days of Service	
17	of the First Amended Complaint	10
18	2. The First Amended Complaint Is a "New Lawsuit"	11
19	a. The First Amended Complaint Is a	
20	Substantially New Suit	11
21	b. Policy Considerations Favor Removal	16
22	D. Plaintiff Is Not Entitled To Attorneys' Fees and Costs	17
23	IV. CONCLUSION.....	18

1 TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
23 Cases
4

3 <u>Baron v. Brown</u> , 83 F.Supp. 520 (D.N.Y. 1949)	8
4 <u>Bator v. Hungarian Commercial Bank</u> , 90 F.Supp. 609 (D.N.Y. 1950)	8
5 <u>Braud v. Transport Serv. Co. of Ill.</u> , 445 F.3d 801 (5 th Cir. 2006)	7, 11
6 <u>Chelkova v. Southland Corp.</u> , 771 N.E.2d 1100 (Ill. App. 2002)	14
7 <u>Cislaw v. Southland Corp.</u> , 4 Cal.App.4 th 1284 (1992)	14
8 <u>Cliett v. Scott</u> , 233 F.2d 269 (5 th Cir. 1956)	7, 11
9 <u>Craig Food Indus., Inc. v. Taco Time Intl., Inc.</u> , 469 F.Supp. 516 (D.Utah 1979) ...	8
10 <u>Daves v. Southland Corp.</u> , 2000 WL 60199 (Wash. App. 2000)	14
11 <u>Davis v. Time Ins. Co.</u> , 698 F.Supp. 1317 (S.D.Miss. 1988)	8, 11
12 <u>Fletcher v. Hamlet</u> , 116 U.S. 408 (1886)	7, 11
13 <u>Garden Homes v. Mason</u> , 143 F.Supp. 144 (D.Mass. 1956)	8, 16
14 <u>Gerety v. Inland Newspaper Representatives</u> , 152 F.Supp. 31 (D.N.Y. 1957)	8
15 <u>Hatcher v. Augustus</u> , 956 F.Supp. 387 (E.D.N.Y. 1997)	15
16 <u>Howell v. Chick-Fil-A, Inc.</u> , 1993 WL 603296 (N.D.Fla. 1993)	15
17 <u>In re Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. Wage and Hour Litigation</u> , 505 F.Supp.2d 609 18 (N.D.Cal. 2007)	13
19 <u>Johnson v. Heublein, Inc.</u> , 227 F.3d 236 (5 th Cir. 2000)	passim
20 <u>Maddock v. KB Homes, Inc.</u> , 2007 WL 2221030 (C.D.Cal. 2007)	12
21 <u>Martin v. Franklin Capital Corp.</u> , 546 U.S. 132 (2005)	17
22 <u>Murphy Bros., Inc. v. Michetti Pipe Stringing, Inc.</u> , 526 U.S. 344 (1999)	10
23 <u>Singh v. 7-Eleven, Inc.</u> , 2007 WL 715488 (N.D.Cal. 2007)	12, 14
24 <u>Wickham v. Southland Corp.</u> , 168 Cal.App.3d 49 (1985)	14
25 <u>Wilson v. Intercollegiate (Big Ten) Conference Athletic Assoc.</u> , 668 F.2d 962 26 (7 th Cir. 1982)	passim

1	Statutes	
2	28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2).....	9
3	28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(5).....	9
4	28 U.S.C. §§ 1332(d) & 1453	9
5	28 U.S.C. §§ 1441 & 1446.....	9
6	Cal Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7	14
7	Cal. Labor Code § 226.7(a).....	11
8	Cal. Labor Code § 226.7(b)	11
9	Cal. Labor Code § 2802(a).....	11
10	Cal. Labor Code § 512(a).....	11
11	Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.....	11
12	Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200	11

13	Rules	
14	Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 11.....	14

15	Treatises	
16	14C Wright, Miller & Cooper, Federal Practice & Procedure	
17	§ 3732 (3d Ed. 1998)	8, 16

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Defendant 7-Eleven, Inc. (“7-Eleven”) hereby opposes Plaintiff’s motion to
2 remand this case to state court. Plaintiff concedes that the allegations in the First
3 Amended Complaint satisfy the jurisdictional requirements for removal. The sole
4 basis for Plaintiff’s motion to remand is her contention that 7-Eleven’s removal
5 was untimely because it should have removed the case based on the original
6 Complaint. Because the First Amended Complaint so changed the nature of this
7 action as to constitute a new lawsuit, 7-Eleven’s filing of a notice of removal
8 within thirty days of receipt of the First Amended Complaint was timely.
9 Accordingly, the Court should retain jurisdiction of this matter and deny Plaintiff’s
10 motion to remand.

11 **I. INTRODUCTION**

12 7-Eleven removed this case to federal court because Plaintiff’s First
13 Amended Complaint so changed the nature of this action as to constitute a new
14 lawsuit against 7-Eleven. The well-settled “revival exception” restores the
15 defendant’s right to remove a case when the complaint is amended in such a
16 manner as to alter the character of the action and constitute essentially a new
17 lawsuit. Because Plaintiff concedes that the First Amended Complaint otherwise
18 satisfies the jurisdictional requirements for removal and because there is no dispute
19 that 7-Eleven removed the case in a timely manner upon receipt of the First
20 Amended Complaint, the only issue before this Court is whether the First
21 Amended Complaint substantially altered the character of this action to constitute
22 essentially a new lawsuit. 7-Eleven respectfully submits that it does and that this
23 Court should retain jurisdiction over this action.

24 On or about April 16, 2007, Plaintiff filed a Complaint against Defendant
25 7-Eleven, Inc. (“7-Eleven”) and its franchisee Defendant Michael Tucker
26 (“Tucker”) in the Superior Court for the State of California, County of Imperial.
27 The original Complaint contained several causes of action based on alleged
28 violations of the California Labor Code. The first cause of action alleged

1 violations of the Labor Code for failure to provide meal or rest breaks, failure to
 2 pay overtime compensation, requiring employees to pay for uniforms, and
 3 noncompliant wage stubs. The second cause of action alleged a claim under
 4 Business and Professions Code § 17200 for the same alleged violations.

5 7-Eleven was named a defendant on both causes of action in the original
 6 Complaint based on the allegation that it was Plaintiff's employer – i.e. a joint
 7 employer with its franchisee Tucker. A finding that 7-Eleven was a joint employer
 8 with Tucker, however, would only extend to the employees of his two stores¹ and
 9 thus could not have triggered any class-wide liability or more than nominal
 10 damages. Recognizing this defect in the original Complaint, Plaintiff has brought
 11 a "new lawsuit" against 7-Eleven.

12 On December 13, 2007, 7-Eleven received Plaintiff's First Amended
 13 Complaint by facsimile. The First Amended Complaint is substantially different
 14 from the original Complaint and constitutes a new lawsuit against 7-Eleven. The
 15 First Amended Complaint includes new claims against 7-Eleven that are
 16 fundamentally different from those in the original Complaint. The new claims
 17 include negligence, negligence per se, and negligence interference with prospective
 18 economic advantage, and a claim for penalties under the California Private
 19 Attorneys General Act, Labor Code § 2699. It is Plaintiff's three new negligence
 20 claims (that are only pled against 7-Eleven) that completely change the nature of
 21 the case with respect to 7-Eleven.²

22

23 ¹ The determination of whether 7-Eleven was a joint employer with Tucker
 24 would depend on a factual inquiry into the actual operations of Tucker's stores.
 25 Such a finding would not extrapolate to the stores throughout California operated
 26 by *different* franchisees at the other 1,200 stores throughout the state. Compare
Maddock v. KB Homes, Inc., 2007 WL 2221030, at *14 (C.D.Cal. 2007).

27 ² Despite a lengthy recitation of the documents in the case, one searches
 28 Plaintiff's motion to remand in vain for any reference to the three new negligence
 claims. Plaintiff's omission is conspicuous given the significance of these claims.

1 Plaintiff's new negligence claims seek for the first time to impose *direct*
 2 liability on 7-Eleven. Unlike the original Complaint, the new negligence claims do
 3 not depend on a finding that Plaintiff, as an employee of Tucker, was also
 4 employed by 7-Eleven. The new negligence claims allege direct liability on the
 5 part of 7-Eleven in providing payroll services to all 1,200 7-Eleven stores in
 6 California. The new claims are also based on a new factual allegation, namely,
 7 that 7-Eleven employed an improper rounding method in paying franchise
 8 employees. In addition, the new claims are not pled against the franchisee, Tucker,
 9 but only against 7-Eleven. The First Amended Complaint also seeks punitive
 10 damages against 7-Eleven based on these new claims in tort, which were not
 11 available under the original Labor Code allegations. Thus, the new negligence
 12 claims significantly change the nature and potential scope of this lawsuit against
 13 7-Eleven. It is a completely different case.

14 7-Eleven removed the case to this court on January 10, 2008, within thirty
 15 days of receipt of the First Amended Complaint. The First Amended Complaint
 16 was the first time that 7-Eleven was placed on notice of the nature of these
 17 substantially different claims. If the Court finds that the First Amended Complaint
 18 constitutes essentially a new lawsuit against 7-Eleven, then it must retain
 19 jurisdiction over this case because Plaintiff has otherwise conceded that the First
 20 Amended Complaint satisfies the jurisdictional requirements for removal.

21 **II. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

22 **A. Procedural History.**

23 Plaintiff filed her original Complaint on or about April 16, 2007.
 24 (*Declaration of Alison M. Miceli ¶ 3 & Ex. A* [hereafter *Miceli Decl.*]). The first
 25 cause of action alleged violations of the California Labor Code by Tucker for
 26 failure to provide meal or rest breaks, failure to pay overtime compensation,
 27 requiring employees to pay for uniforms, and noncompliant wage stubs. (*Id.* Ex. A
 28 ¶¶ 21-34). The second cause of action alleged a claim under Business and

1 Professions Code § 17200 for the same alleged violations. (*Id.* Ex. A ¶¶ 36-48).
 2 7-Eleven was named a defendant on both causes of action based on the allegation
 3 that it was Plaintiff's employer. (*See Plaintiff's Points and Authorities in Support*
 4 *of Motion to Remand* at 3 ("alleged that 7-ELEVEN was the employer") [hereafter
 5 *Pl. Memo.*]; *see also* *Miceli Decl.* Ex. A ¶ 18).

6 On December 13, 2007, 7-Eleven received Plaintiff's First Amended
 7 Complaint by facsimile. (*Declaration of Eric A. Welter* ¶ 2 & Ex. A [hereafter
 8 *Welter Decl.*]). The First Amended Complaint includes new claims against
 9 7-Eleven for negligence, negligence per se, and negligence interference with
 10 prospective economic advantage, and a new claim for penalties under the
 11 California Private Attorneys General Act, Labor Code § 2699. (*Miceli Decl.* Ex. K
 12 ¶¶ 23-44). The new claims are asserted only against defendant 7-Eleven, Inc. (*Id.*)
 13 The First Amended Complaint was filed by the state court on December 18, 2007.
 14 (*Miceli Decl.* Ex. K; *Pl. Memo.* at 4). 7-Eleven removed the case to this Court on
 15 January 10, 2008. (*Docket No. 1*).

16 **B. The Parties.**

17 7-Eleven, Inc. owns, operates, and franchises retail food stores under the
 18 trademarked name "7-ELEVEN." (*Welter Decl.* ¶ 4 & Ex. D at 2 (*Tucker's*
 19 *Responses to Request for Admissions*) [hereafter "Tucker Adm."]). In 2006,
 20 7-Eleven had approximately 1,200 franchise stores in California. (*Declaration of*
 21 *Larry Borders* ¶ 2 [hereafter *Borders Decl.*]). In 2006, 19,346 individuals were on
 22 the payroll of 7-Eleven's California franchisees. (*Id.* ¶ 2).

23 During the relevant time period, Defendant Michael Tucker was the
 24 franchise owner of Store Nos. 22818 and 23229 in Brawley, California. (*Tucker*
 25 *Adm.* at 2-3; *Welter Decl.* ¶ 3 & Ex. C (*7-Eleven's Request for Admission to*
 26 *Tucker*) [hereafter "7-Eleven Req. Adm."]). Plaintiff worked at both stores during
 27 her tenure with Tucker from 2005 through 2007. (*Borders Decl.* ¶ 3; *First Amd.*
 28

1 *Compl.* ¶ 19). In 2006, Tucker's two stores had a total of 53 individuals on the
 2 payroll. (*Borders Decl.* ¶ 4).

3 **C. The Independent Contractor Relationship Between 7-Eleven and
 4 Tucker.**

5 Plaintiff acknowledges that a franchise agreement existed between 7-Eleven
 6 and Tucker and has attached an excerpt of the agreement as Exhibit D to the First
 7 Amended Complaint. (*First Amd. Compl.* ¶ 21 & Ex. D). Plaintiff further alleges
 8 that as part of the franchise relationship, 7-Eleven agreed to provide payroll
 9 services to Tucker. (*Id.* ¶ 20). 7-Eleven has lodged a copy of the agreement with
 10 the Court. (*Memorandum in Support of Defendant's Motion for Judgment on the
 11 Pleadings, Declaration of Eric A. Welter* ¶ 2 & Ex. A [hereafter *Franchise Agr.*];³
 12 *see also Tucker Adm.* at 3).

13 Plaintiff alleges that, pursuant to the franchise agreement, 7-Eleven
 14 configured and processed the payroll for Tucker. (*First Amd. Compl.* ¶ 20).
 15 Paragraph 12 of the franchise agreement provides that the franchisee agrees to
 16 "prepare and furnish to" 7-Eleven "time and wage authorizations for your Store
 17 employees." (*Franchise Agr.* ¶ 12(c)(1)). The franchise agreement contains the
 18 explicit acknowledgment of the franchisee that 7-Eleven is "relying on the
 19 accuracy of all information you and your employees provide, including all payroll
 20 information." (*Id.* ¶ 12(c)(3)). The franchise agreement further provides that "all
 21 information that you [Tucker] and your employees provide will be truthful,
 22 accurate, complete and in compliance with all applicable laws." (*Id.* Ex. D, ¶
 23 12(c)(3)). The franchisee also agrees "at all times [to] use the 7-Eleven Payroll
 24 System in accordance with our standards." (*Id.* ¶ 19(h)).

25
 26
 27

28 ³ Docket No. 8, Exhibit 4.

1 The franchise agreement also establishes an independent contractor
2 relationship between Tucker and 7-Eleven. Paragraph 2 of the franchise agreement
3 provides:

4 **2. Independent Contractor.** You and we agree that this Agreement
5 creates an arm's-length business relationship and does not create any
6 fiduciary, special or other similar relationship. You agree: (a) to hold
7 yourself out to the public as an independent contractor; (b) to control the
8 manner and means of the operation of the Store; and (c) to exercise complete
9 control over and responsibility for all labor relations and the conduct of your
10 agents and employees, including the day-to-day operations of the Store and
11 all Store employees. You and your agents and employees may not: (i) be
12 considered or held out to be our agents or employees or (ii) negotiate or
13 enter any agreement or incur any liability in our name, on our behalf, or
14 purporting to bind us or any of our or your successors-in-interest. Without
15 in any way limiting the preceding statements, we do not exercise any
16 discretion or control over your employment policies or employment
17 decisions. All employees of the Store are solely your employees and you
18 will control the manner and means of the operation of the Store. No actions
19 you, your agents or employees take will be attributable to us or be
20 considered to be actions obligating us.

21 (*Id.* ¶ 2). Tucker further admits that he was not an employee of 7-Eleven. (*Tucker*
22 *Adm.* at 3-4).

23 Tucker was responsible for the overall operations of his store. (*Tucker Adm.*
24 at 6, 13). Tucker was responsible for setting the prices of merchandise, ordering
25 inventory, for hiring his employees, and for firing his employees. (*Id.* at 6, 14).
26 Tucker was responsible for the labor and employment relations at his store;
27 7-Eleven was not. (*Id.* at 12-13). Tucker was responsible for controlling the
28 manner and means in which his employees performed their duties at his store;

1 7-Eleven was not. (*Id.* at 13-14). No one at 7-Eleven told him who to hire or who
2 to fire. (*Id.* at 6-7). Tucker was responsible for training the employees at his store.
3 (*Id.* at 13). Tucker was responsible for handling scheduling and vacation requests
4 for his employees; no one at 7-Eleven told him when to schedule his employee's
5 vacations. (*Id.* at 7). Tucker decided the rate of pay each of his employees would
6 earn and which employees received pay raises and how much for. (*Id.*) No one at
7 7-Eleven told Tucker how much to pay his employees. (*Id.*) Tucker was
8 responsible for employee discipline at his store; 7-Eleven was not. (*Id.* at 14).
9 Tucker determined the appropriate number of employees for each shift at his store;
10 7-Eleven did not. (*Id.* at 12). Tucker was responsible for the daily cash report for
11 his store and for handling customer complaints at his store. (*Id.* at 11). Tucker
12 hired Plaintiff, set her rate of pay, gave her one or more pay increases, set her
13 schedule and made the decision to terminate Plaintiff's employment. (*Id.* at 9-11,
14 15).

15 **III. LEGAL ARGUMENT**

16 **A. The Applicable Legal Standard.**

17 “[T]he authorities are overwhelming that, though a defendant has submitted
18 himself to state court jurisdiction on one cause of action, this does not prevent his
19 removing the cause when an entirely new and different cause of action is filed.”
20 Cliett v. Scott, 233 F.2d 269, 271 (5th Cir. 1956). “The courts . . . have read into
21 the [removal] statute an exception for the case where the plaintiff files an amended
22 complaint that so changes the nature of his action as to constitute ‘substantially a
23 new suit begun that day.’” Wilson v. Intercollegiate (Big Ten) Conference
24 Athletic Assoc., 668 F.2d 962, 965 (7th Cir. 1982) (quoting Fletcher v. Hamlet, 116
25 U.S. 408, 410 (1886)).

26 “Although ‘an amendment of the complaint will not revive the period for
27 removal if a state court case previously was removable but the defendant failed to
28 exercise his right to do so,’ a different result is generally reached if the pleading

1 amendment provides (1) a ‘new basis for removal’ or (2) ‘changes the character of
 2 the litigation so as to make it substantially a new suit.’” Braud v. Transport Serv.
 3 Co. of Ill., 445 F.3d 801, 806 (5th Cir. 2006) (quotation omitted). “This seems
 4 quite appropriate since a willingness on the part of the defendant to remain in a
 5 state court to litigate a particular claim should not be interpreted as a willingness
 6 on his part to remain in a state court to adjudicate a completely different claim.”
 7 14C Wright, Miller & Cooper, Federal Practice & Procedure § 3732 (3d Ed. 1998);
 8 see also Garden Homes v. Mason, 143 F.Supp. 144 (D.Mass. 1956) (“Willingness
 9 to remain in the state court for one cause of action does not show a willingness, or
 10 constitute a waiver, as to some quite different cause.”).

11 “The revival exception provides that a lapsed right to remove an initially
 12 removable case within thirty days is restored when the complaint is amended so
 13 substantially as to alter the character of the action and constitute essentially a new
 14 lawsuit.” Johnson v. Heublein, Inc., 227 F.3d 236, 241 (5th Cir. 2000). The
 15 holdings in this regard generally reflect “amendments of the pleadings which
 16 resulted in the advancement of different theories for recovery.” Davis v. Time Ins.
 17 Co., 698 F.Supp. 1317, 1322 (S.D.Miss. 1988); see, e.g., Craig Food Indus., Inc. v.
 18 Taco Time Intl., Inc., 469 F.Supp. 516 (D.Utah 1979); Gerety v. Inland Newspaper
 19 Representatives, 152 F.Supp. 31 (D.N.Y. 1957) (amended complaint asserted two
 20 new causes of action); Bator v. Hungarian Commercial Bank, 90 F.Supp. 609
 21 (D.N.Y. 1950); Baron v. Brown, 83 F.Supp. 520 (D.N.Y. 1949).

22 “The right to revive must be determined in each case with reference to its
 23 purposes and those of the 30-day limitation on removal to which it is an exception,
 24 and against a background of general considerations relating to the proper allocation
 25 of decision-making responsibilities between state and federal courts.” Wilson, 668
 26 F.2d at 965. These considerations are not implicated, however, where the
 27 amendments create a substantially new case: “Amendments might fundamentally
 28 alter a complaint not because the plaintiff had been trying to mislead the defendant

1 but because new facts had come to light in the course of pretrial discovery. In such
 2 a case – where the amended complaint if effect begins a new case – using the 30-
 3 day limitation in section 1446(b) to bar removal would not serve the purposes of
 4 the limitation in any significant way.” *Id.* at 966.

5 **B. 7-Eleven Has Established the Substantive Elements for
 6 Removal Jurisdiction.**

7 7-Eleven removed this case based on the provisions of the Class Action
 8 Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332(d) & 1453 (“CAFA”) and the general removal
 9 statute, 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441 & 1446. The CAFA applies to class action lawsuits
 10 where the aggregate number of all proposed plaintiff classes is 100 or more
 11 persons. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(5). According to the First Amended Complaint, the
 12 potential class consists of 5,000 individuals. (*First Amd. Comp.* ¶ 11). Plaintiff
 13 also concedes that the First Amended Complaint satisfies the CAFA requirement
 14 that the aggregate amount in controversy exceed \$5,000,000.⁴ (*Pl. Memo.* at 1-2,
 15 7-9). Indeed, Plaintiff admits that her meal and rest break claim within the First
 16 Amended Complaint alone satisfies the \$5,000,000 amount in controversy
 17 requirement of the CAFA. (*Pl. Memo.* at 7).

18 There is also no dispute that the First Amended Complaint satisfies the
 19 CAFA requirement that any class member be a citizen of a state different from any
 20 defendant. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2). 7-Eleven is a corporation incorporated in and
 21 under the laws of the State of Texas, and it is and has been at all material times a
 22 citizen of that state; 7-Eleven’s corporate headquarters and principal place of
 23 business is in Dallas, Texas; 7 Eleven is not a citizen of the State of California.

24
 25

⁴ Plaintiff states that the factual allegations in the original Complaint and the
 26 First Amended Complaint are identical, (*Pl. Memo.* at 9), and that the original
 27 Complaint was removable, (*id.* at 14). Because Plaintiff argues that the original
 28 Complaint was removable, *a fortiori*, Plaintiff concedes that the First Amended
 Complaint likewise contains sufficient factual allegations to support removal.

1 (See *First Amd. Compl.* ¶ 5; *Notice of Removal* ¶ 9(a)). Plaintiff is a resident of the
 2 State of California. (*First Amd. Compl.* ¶ 4).

3 Thus, Plaintiff does not dispute in her motion to remand that 7-Eleven has
 4 established each of the elements necessary for removal under the CAFA. Indeed,
 5 Plaintiff acknowledges that her pleadings satisfy the CAFA and are removable.
 6 (See, e.g., *Pl. Memo.* at 2, 6, 7, 14). Plaintiff's sole argument against removal is
 7 that 7-Eleven's removal was untimely because it should have removed the case
 8 based on the original Complaint.

9 **C. 7-Eleven's Removal of the First Amended Complaint Was Timely.**

10 Having conceded that the First Amended Complaint satisfies the
 11 jurisdictional requirements for removal to this Court, Plaintiff argues that
 12 7-Eleven's notice of removal was untimely. Because Plaintiff's First Amended
 13 Complaint so changed the nature of this action as to constitute a new lawsuit
 14 against 7-Eleven, however, 7-Eleven's removal of this case within thirty days of
 15 service of the First Amended Complaint was timely.

16 **1. 7-Eleven Removed Within Thirty Days of Service of
 17 the First Amended Complaint.**

18 Plaintiff quibbles that 7-Eleven should have known that she had an *intent* to
 19 file an amended complaint based on a series of correspondence sent to 7-Eleven's
 20 counsel before she actually filed and served the First Amended Complaint, and
 21 therefore 7-Eleven did not remove the First Amended Complaint within thirty days
 22 of these letters. Plaintiff does not cite the United States Supreme Court decision of
 23 Murphy Bros., Inc. v. Michetti Pipe Stringing, Inc., 526 U.S. 344 (1999), which
 24 disposes of her argument.

25 In Murphy Brothers, the Supreme Court held that even a courtesy copy of a
 26 filed complaint sent to the defendant did not trigger the thirty day period to
 27 remove. The time to remove is triggered by formal service of the complaint. *Id.* at
 28 356. Here, the First Amended Complaint was first sent to 7-Eleven's counsel on

1 December 13, 2007, and was filed with the state court on December 18, 2007.
 2 Therefore, 7-Eleven's removal on January 10, 2008, was not only timely, but early.

3 **2. The First Amended Complaint Is a "New Lawsuit."**

4 Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint so changed the nature of this action as
 5 to constitute a new lawsuit against 7-Eleven. Because 7-Eleven timely filed its
 6 notice of removal after receipt of the First Amended Complaint, this Court should
 7 retain jurisdiction of this matter.

8 As noted above, "the authorities are overwhelming that, though a defendant
 9 has submitted himself to state court jurisdiction on one cause of action, this does
 10 not prevent his removing the cause when an entirely new and different cause of
 11 action is filed." Cliett, 233 F.2d at 271. The dispositive question on this motion is
 12 whether Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint "so changes the nature of [her] action
 13 as to constitute 'substantially a new suit.'" Wilson, 668 F.2d at 965 (quoting
 14 Fletcher v. Hamlet, 116 U.S. 408, 410 (1886)); see also Braud, 445 F.3d at 806;
 15 Johnson, 227 F.3d at 241; Davis, 698 F.Supp. at 1322.

16 **a. The First Amended Complaint Is a
 17 Substantially New Suit.**

18 Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint is a substantially new lawsuit against
 19 7-Eleven. The First Amended Complaint contains new claims, new factual
 20 allegations, a new claim for punitive damages and a larger potential class of
 21 putative plaintiffs. Therefore, the revival exception should apply here.

22 7-Eleven's potential liability on all causes of action in the original
 23 Complaint was conditioned on a finding that it was Plaintiff's employer along with
 24 its franchisee Tucker. The First Cause of Action alleged violations of the Labor
 25 Code by Tucker for failure to provide meal or rest breaks, failure to pay overtime
 26 compensation, requiring employees to pay for uniforms, and noncompliant wage
 27 stubs. Each of the Labor Code sections cited in the First Cause of Action required
 28 a finding that the defendant was the plaintiff's employer in order for liability to

1 attach. Cal. Labor Code §§ 226 (“Every *employer* shall . . . furnish each of his or
 2 her *employees* . . .”); 226.7(a) (“No *employer* shall require any *employee* . . .”);
 3 226.7(b) (“If an *employer* fails to provide an *employee* . . .”); 512(a) (“An
 4 *employer* may not employ an *employee* . . .”); 2802(a) (“An *employer* shall
 5 indemnify his or her *employee* . . .”) (emphasis added). Plaintiff’s Second Cause
 6 of Action, under Business & Professions Code § 17200, was based upon the same
 7 underlying violations of the California Labor Code as the First Cause of Action.
 8 (*Compl.* ¶ 40). Thus, all of the causes of action in the original Complaint depended
 9 on a finding that in addition to being an employee of Tucker, Plaintiff was also an
 10 employee of 7-Eleven.

11 This Court would ultimately make the determination whether 7-Eleven was
 12 Plaintiff’s employer by looking at whether 7-Eleven actually exercised control
 13 over the daily activities at Tucker’s store. Singh v. 7-Eleven, Inc., 2007 WL
 14 715488, at *6-7 (N.D.Cal. 2007). This is a fact-based determination under
 15 California law. See id. The practical effect of this fact-based determination would
 16 be to limit the scope of any potential class action to Tucker’s two stores. See, e.g.,
 17 Maddock v. KB Homes, Inc., 2007 WL 2221030 (C.D.Cal. 2007) (finding that
 18 class action was not appropriate against parent corporation because individual
 19 determinations would have to be made as to whether it was the employer of each
 20 plaintiff in separate subsidiaries and the facts before the court suggested that it was
 21 not, in fact, their employer). Thus, the potential scope of the original Complaint
 22 extended only to employees of two stores.

23 The First Amended Complaint completely changed the nature of the case as
 24 against 7-Eleven. The First, Second and Third Causes of Action are new claims
 25 sounding in negligence. The original Complaint did not contain any tort claims.
 26 The three new negligence claims are only asserted against 7-Eleven, not against
 27
 28

1 Tucker.⁵ The new negligence claims seek to impose *direct* liability on 7-Eleven
 2 for its activities in operating a payroll service for all of its 1,200 California
 3 franchisee stores rather than a contingent liability aimed only at Tucker's two
 4 stores. These claims do not depend in any way on a finding that 7-Eleven was
 5 Plaintiff's employer. Plaintiff's new "negligent payrolling" claims are also based
 6 on a new factual allegation that 7-Eleven used an improper method of rounding
 7 employee time. Plaintiff also seeks to recover punitive damages on the negligence
 8 claims, while punitive damages were not recoverable based on the Labor Code and
 9 Section 17200 claims in the original Complaint. See In re Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.
 10 Wage and Hour Litigation, 505 F.Supp.2d 609, 620-21 (N.D.Cal. 2007).

11 The potential class on Plaintiff's original Complaint was limited to the
 12 employees of Tucker's two stores (53 individuals in 2006). The potential class on
 13 Plaintiff new negligent payroll claims could implicate all employees of 7-Eleven
 14 franchisees in California (19,346 individuals in 2006). In sum, the three new
 15 negligence claims constitute a new lawsuit against 7-Eleven on a new subject
 16 matter, based on new factual allegations, implicating new potential damages
 17 liability, and implicating a larger potential class of putative plaintiffs.

18 The Johnson case is strikingly similar to the case at bar. In Johnson, the
 19 original complaint stated claims on a promissory note and for conversion of a piece
 20 of equipment against the defendants. Johnson, supra, 227 F.3d at 239. Prior to a
 21 ruling on the merits, two of the defendants confessed to a judgment and assigned to
 22 the plaintiffs any claims they had against the remaining defendants. Id. The
 23 plaintiffs then filed an amended complaint in which they asserted for the first time
 24 claims for breach of contract, bad faith, unjust enrichment and fraud against the

25
 26
 27 ⁵ This point highlights how different the new negligence claims are because
 28 they do not even implicate the liability of the franchisee defendant, Tucker.

1 remaining defendants. Id. The remaining defendants removed the case at that time
 2 and the plaintiffs filed a motion to remand claiming untimely removal. Id.

3 The district court denied the motion to remand. The Fifth Circuit affirmed,
 4 finding that the amended complaint met the criteria for the revival exception. Id. at
 5 241-42. The court found that “the allegations in the [amended complaint] bear no
 6 resemblance whatsoever to the allegations of the [original complaint].” Id. at 242.
 7 Specifically, the court noted that “[a]fter the complaint was amended, the Co-
 8 defendants were confronted with a suit on a construction contract involving
 9 exposure to substantial compensatory and punitive damages, instead of only a
 10 questionable conversion claim by a competing creditor with an apparently inferior
 11 lien.” Id. Thus, “the amended complaint state[d] a virtually new, more complex
 12 and substantial case against the Co-defendants upon which no significant
 13 proceedings have been held.” Id. Under such circumstances, the Fifth Circuit
 14 upheld the application of the revival exception and the removal.

15 As in Johnson, the new claims in the First Amended Complaint contain
 16 allegations that bear no resemblance to the original Complaint. The original
 17 Complaint alleged straightforward violations of the California Labor Code – i.e.
 18 failure to pay overtime, failure to provide meal and rest breaks – aimed at a few
 19 stores of one 7-Eleven franchisee. On the other hand, the First Amended
 20 Complaint contains three new negligence claims based on new allegations of
 21 alleged misconduct by 7-Eleven across the State of California. For example,
 22 Plaintiff now alleges that 7-Eleven used an “illegal rounding system of employee
 23 work time calculation” for its franchise payroll. (*First Amd. Compl.* ¶ 25). This
 24 allegation, which is part of the basis for the new negligence claims, does not
 25 appear in the original Complaint. The claims in the original Complaint required a
 26 finding that 7-Eleven was Plaintiff’s employer; the new negligence claims do not.
 27 Indeed, the three new negligence claims simply bear no resemblance to the claims
 28 asserted in the original Complaint.

1 Like Johnson, 7-Eleven was originally facing a highly questionable lawsuit
 2 that did not even appear to be warranted by existing law or by a nonfrivolous
 3 argument for extending, modifying or reversing existing law. See Fed. R. Civ.
 4 Pro. 11; Cal Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7. The California courts have repeatedly
 5 upheld the independent contractor relationship between 7-Eleven and its
 6 franchisees, holding that 7-Eleven is not the employer of its franchisee's
 7 employees nor is it an agent of the franchisee. Singh v. 7-Eleven, Inc., 2007 WL
 8 715488 (N.D.Cal. 2007); Cislaw v. Southland Corp., 4 Cal.App.4th 1284 (1992);
 9 Wickham v. Southland Corp., 168 Cal.App.3d 49 (1985); see also Chelkova v.
 10 Southland Corp., 771 N.E.2d 1100 (Ill. App. 2002); Daves v. Southland Corp.,
 11 2000 WL 60199 (Wash. App. 2000); Hatcher v. Augustus, 956 F.Supp. 387
 12 (E.D.N.Y. 1997). Indeed, there is a paucity of reported decisions nationwide
 13 holding franchisors liable for the wage and hour violations of its franchisee. See,
 14 e.g., Howell v. Chick-Fil-A, Inc., 1993 WL 603296, *2 n.2 (N.D.Fla. 1993) (noting
 15 in FLSA case brought by employee of franchisee against franchisor that that court
 16 has “not discovered a reported case in which a franchisor has been held liable to an
 17 employee of an independent contractor.”).

18 As in Johnson, the First Amended Complaint presented 7-Eleven with new
 19 legal theories that posed a significantly different exposure to damages. The new
 20 negligence claims in the First Amended Complaint seek to impose direct liability
 21 on 7-Eleven across its franchise system in California and do not require a finding
 22 that 7-Eleven also employed Plaintiff along with Tucker. The potential liability on
 23 the new claims is significantly larger than on the claims in the original Complaint.
 24 Further, Plaintiff is seeking punitive damages on her negligence claims – damages
 25 that were not previously available on her statutory Labor Code claims. Likewise,
 26 Plaintiff is seeking collective relief under the California Private Attorneys General
 27 Act not previously sought in the original Complaint. Moreover, the potential
 28 damages pleaded in the original Complaint were less than \$75,000 and limited to

1 Tucker's stores based on a finding that 7-Eleven was Plaintiff's "employer." As
 2 the authorities above demonstrate (which Plaintiff was required to follow before
 3 filing her original Complaint in order that it not be frivolous), there can be no legal
 4 basis to extrapolate any finding of employer status regarding Tucker to 1,200
 5 stores owned and operated by different franchisees. Thus, the scope of potential
 6 liability on the original Complaint was quite narrow.

7 As in Johnson, this Court should find that the First Amended Complaint is a
 8 "virtually new, more complex and substantial case" against 7-Eleven and retain
 9 jurisdiction over this case.

10 **b. Policy Considerations Favor Removal.**

11 Important policy considerations also favor the exercise of removal
 12 jurisdiction in this case. First, 7-Eleven's willingness to remain in state court to
 13 litigate the original claims in this case should not be viewed as a blanket
 14 willingness to litigate new claims in state court to conclusion. Second, Plaintiff is
 15 not procedurally prejudiced by removal to federal court because she made the
 16 choice to plead substantially different claims against 7-Eleven.

17 It is not unreasonable for a defendant who is willing to remain in state court
 18 given the original nature of a case to conclude that it is unwilling to remain in state
 19 court to adjudicate a completely different claim. 14C Wright, Miller & Cooper,
 20 Federal Practice & Procedure § 3732 (3d Ed. 1998) ("a willingness on the part of
 21 the defendant to remain in a state court to litigate a particular claim should not be
 22 interpreted as a willingness on his part to remain in a state court to adjudicate a
 23 completely different claim"); see also Garden Homes v. Mason, 143 F.Supp. 144
 24 (D.Mass. 1956) ("Willingness to remain in the state court for one cause of action
 25 does not show a willingness, or constitute a waiver, as to some quite different
 26 cause."). Such is the case here. As noted above, the new negligence claims
 27 dramatically change the nature and potential scope of this case. 7-Eleven certainly
 28

1 could choose to litigate a case involving two stores in state court while deciding
 2 that litigating a case involving 1,200 stores should be in federal court.

3 In addition, the policy considerations behind the 30-day limitation on
 4 removal are not implicated here. Wilson, 668 F.2d at 965-66 (“where the amended
 5 complaint if effect begins a new case – using the 30-day limitation in section
 6 1446(b) to bar removal would not serve the purposes of the limitation in any
 7 significant way”). It was *Plaintiff*’s decision to delay the assertion of substantial
 8 claims against 7-Eleven until the First Amended Complaint. Indeed, it is apparent
 9 that Plaintiff brought the First Amended Complaint because she recognized that
 10 her theory of liability against 7-Eleven in the original Complaint did not hold
 11 water.

12 Although the parties have exchanged written discovery, no depositions have
 13 been taken in this case. Because no significant proceedings have been held in the
 14 state court, “the removal will not result in delay, waste or undue tactical advantage
 15 to a party.” Johnson, 227 F.3d at 242. Given these facts, 7-Eleven’s removal of
 16 the case to federal court should not be viewed as a procedural mechanism to
 17 prejudice Plaintiff by “seeing how the case goes in state court and removing.” Id.

18 **D. Plaintiff Is Not Entitled To Attorneys’ Fees and Costs.**

19 Plaintiff requests an award of attorneys’ fees and costs in her motion.
 20 Sanctions are not appropriate, however, where a defendant had an “objectively
 21 reasonable ground” for the removal. See Martin v. Franklin Capital Corp., 546
 22 U.S. 132, 141 (2005). 7-Eleven submits that, based on the foregoing arguments, it
 23 had an objectively reasonable ground for the removal of this action. Significantly,
 24 Plaintiff herself concedes that the First Amended Complaint is removable on its
 25 face. Plaintiff’s sole objection to removal is that it was untimely. Plaintiff has not
 26
 27
 28

presented sufficient grounds for remand or for an award of attorneys' fees and costs in this case.⁶

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, 7-Eleven respectfully requests that the Court deny Plaintiff's motion to remand and retain jurisdiction over this action.

DATED: February 15, 2008 WELTER LAW FIRM, P.C.

By: /s/ Eric A. Welter

ERIC A. WELTER

Attorneys for Defendant
7-ELEVEN, INC.

⁶ Plaintiff's counsel also represented in his correspondence regarding removal that they did not intend to ask for attorneys' fees and costs. (*Miceli Decl.* Ex. O).

1 PROOF OF SERVICE

2 (Aleksick v. 7-Eleven, Inc., et al.)

3 STATE OF VIRGINIA, COUNTY OF FAIRFAX

4 I am employed in the County of Fairfax, Commonwealth of Virginia. I am
5 over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 720
6 Lynn Street, Suite B, Herndon, Virginia 20170.7 On February 15, 2008, I served the following documents described as
8 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES OF DEFENDANT
9 7-ELEVEN, INC. IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO REMAND
10 TO STATE COURT; DECLARATION OF ERIC A. WELTER; DECLARATION
11 OF LARRY BORDERS on all interested parties in this action as follows:

12

13 (ECF) by filing the above with the Court's ECF system which
14 accomplishes electronic service on all registered ECF users listed
15 below and by any parties not registered for electronic service as
16 indicated below.

17 (BY FAX) by transmitting via facsimile the document(s) listed above
18 to the fax number(s) set forth below on this date. The facsimile
19 machine I used complied with California Rules of Court, Rule 2003(3)
20 and the transmission was reported as complete and without error by the
21 machine. Pursuant to California Rules of Court, Rule 2008(e)(4), I
22 caused the machine to print a transmission record of the transmission, a
23 copy of which is attached to this declaration.

24 (BY MAIL) by causing a true and correct copy of the above to be
25 placed in the United States Mail at Herndon, Virginia, in sealed
26 envelope(s) with postage prepaid, addressed as set forth below. I am
27 readily familiar with this law firm's practice for collection and
28 processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal
Service. Correspondence is deposited with the United States Postal
Service the same day it is left for collection and processing in the
ordinary course of business.

1 (EXPRESS MAIL/OVERNIGHT DELIVERY) by causing a true and
2 correct copy of the document(s) listed above to be delivered by
3 _____ in sealed envelope(s) with all fees prepaid at the
4 address(es) set forth below.

5 (PERSONAL SERVICE) by causing a true and correct copy of the
6 above documents to be hand delivered in sealed envelope(s) with all
7 fees fully paid to the person(s) at the address(es) set forth below.

8 Alison M. Miceli, Esq. (via ECF)
9 SULLIVAN & CHRISTIANI, LLP
10 2330 Third Avenue
11 San Diego, CA 92101
12 Tel. 619-702-6760 Fax 619-702-6761
13 Counsel for Plaintiff

14 William B. Sullivan, Esq. (via U.S. Mail)
15 SULLIVAN & CHRISTIANI, LLP
16 2330 Third Avenue
17 San Diego, CA 92101
18 Tel. 619-702-6760 Fax 619-702-6761
19 Counsel for Plaintiff

20 Eric C. Sohlgren, Esq. (via ECF)
21 Lindley Fraley, Esq.
22 PAYNE & FEARS LLP
23 4 Park Plaza, Suite 1100
24 Irvine, CA 92614
25 Tel. 949-851-1100 Fax 949-851-1212
26 Co-Counsel for Defendant

27 Paul C. Johnson, Esq. (via ECF)
28 BACALSKI, OTTOSON & Dubé LLP
29 402 West Broadway, 24th Floor
30 P.O. Box 120270
31 San Diego, CA 92112-0270
32 Tel. 619-239-4340 Fax 619-239-0116
33 Counsel for Defendant Michael Tucker

1
2 Executed on February 15, 2008, at Herndon, Virginia.
3
4

5 /s/ Eric A. Welter
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ERIC A. WELTER